

2019 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Human Genome Research Institute Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 09/26/2020 05:22:33 AM

1. Department or Agency Department of Health and Human Services	2. Fiscal Year 2019
3. Committee or Subcommittee National Human Genome Research Institute Special Emphasis Panel	3b. GSA Committee No. 2085

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year? No	5. Current Charter 09/29/1995	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
---	---	---------------------------------	------------------------------

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear? No	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date
--	---	-----------------------------

9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear Continue	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate? Not Applicable	10b. Legislation Pending? Not Applicable
---	---	--

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority 42 USC 282(b)(16)	13. Effective Date 11/20/1985	14. Committee Type Continuing	14c. Presidential? No
--	---	---	---------------------------------

15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total Number of Reports No Reports for this FiscalYear

17a. Open 0 **17b. Closed** 12 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total Meetings and Dates** 12

Purpose	Start	End
NIH Peer Review	11/09/2018	- 11/09/2018
NIH Peer Review	12/06/2018	- 12/07/2018
NIH Peer Review	12/14/2018	- 12/14/2018
NIH Peer Review	03/11/2019	- 03/11/2019
NIH Peer Review	03/13/2019	- 03/13/2019
NIH Peer Review	03/21/2019	- 03/21/2019
NIH Peer Review	03/22/2019	- 03/22/2019
NIH Peer Review	03/25/2019	- 03/25/2019
NIH Peer Review	06/11/2019	- 06/11/2019
NIH Peer Review	06/11/2019	- 06/11/2019
NIH Peer Review	06/19/2019	- 06/19/2019
NIH Peer Review	06/27/2019	- 06/27/2019

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 12

Current FY Next FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$28,200.00	\$28,200.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$471,024.00	\$479,974.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$23,014.00	\$23,272.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$8,745.00	\$8,920.00
18d. Total	\$530,983.00	\$540,366.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	2.60	2.60

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of --(A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts.... This committee is composed entirely of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) in the areas relevant to genomic research including: construction of genetic maps, development of physical maps, determination of DNA sequences, management and analysis of the resulting data, development of innovative technologies required to achieve the above, and development of tools and resources supportive of this effort, as well as in areas relevant to the ethical, legal, and social implication of the genomic research. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 120 applications in the amount of \$466,991,843.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the fields of biologic informatics, software design of genetic information systems, molecular cytogenetics, human gene mapping, gene transfer, gene therapy, physical mapping, comparative genetics, genetic mapping, population genetics, epidemiology, developmental biology, informatics, sequencing, instrumentation computer analysis, chemistry and cytogenetics, and the ethical, legal, and social implications of human genome research.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The committee held 12 meetings during this report period.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained

elsewhere?

This committee is composed entirely of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from establish sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the National Human Genome Research Institute Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and/or contract proposals. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

Reports: This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. The DFO and Decision Maker are the same person, the Co-Chief of the Scientific Review Branch, NHGRI, based on the assignment of duties within the Institute. URL: The committee does not maintain a website. Due to the large number of members serving on this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide additional information on Occupation or Affiliation. Additional information on an individual's affiliation may be obtained by contacting staff listed in this report. Zip Codes: Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

Designated Federal Officer

KEN D. NAKAMURA CO-CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BRANCH

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Abate, Adam	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
BERG, JONATHAN	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
BROOKS, ANDREW	12/14/2018	12/14/2018	Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
BROWN, C.	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
BULT, CAROL	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bateman, Alex	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Senior Team Leader, Protein Sequence Resources	Peer Review Consultant Member

Belmont, John	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Senior Principal Medical Scientist	Peer Review Consultant Member
Blanc, Victoria	12/14/2018	12/14/2018	Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bloom, Toby	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Deputy Scientific Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Braun, Rosemary	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bravo, Hector	11/09/2018	11/09/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHISHOLM, REX	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
COLLINS, PHILIP	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
CONRAD, DONALD	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Calin, George	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Camberg, Jodi	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Conesa Cegarra, Ana	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Cox, Nancy	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
DEWAR, Ken	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
DWINELL, MELINDA	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Ding, Li	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Doyle, Shannon	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Staff Scientist	Peer Review Consultant Member
Dubois, James	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Dwyer, Jason	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Efcavitch, John	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Founder and Chief Scientific Officer	Peer Review Consultant Member
FRASER, CLAIRE	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
FRAZER, KELLY	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Furey, Terrence	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
GINGERAS, THOMAS	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Professor and Head	Peer Review Consultant Member
GUIGO, RODERIC	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor Scientific Coordinator	Peer Review Consultant Member
GUNDLACH, JENS	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
GUO, BAOCHUAN	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gabriel, Stacey	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Senior Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gastier-Foster, Julie	12/14/2018	12/14/2018	Senior Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gregory, Richard	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Gymrek, Melissa	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HARRISON, PAUL	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HARRIS, TIMOTHY	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
HARTMAN, JOHN	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAUSER, MICHAEL	12/14/2018	12/14/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HISAMA, FUKI	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hamilton, Carol	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Handsaker, Robert	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Senior Principal Software Engineer	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hauser, Elizabeth	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hirst, Martin	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Associate Professor and Head of Epigenomics	Peer Review Consultant Member
Holmes, Ian	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
JACK, WILLIAM	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Executive Director of Research	Peer Review Consultant Member
Jewell, Scott	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Jorde, Lynn	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Professor and Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
KIBBE, WARREN	11/09/2018	11/09/2018	Chief	Peer Review Consultant Member
KWOK, Pui-Yan	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Henry Bachrach Distinguished Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kahn, Jeffrey	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kenny, Eimear	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Ko, Dennis	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Korgiebel, Diane	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
LANDY, ARTHUR	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Langmead, Benjamin	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Leburton, Jean-Pierre	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Leslie, Christina	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Member	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lidke, Keith	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lindblad-Toh, Kerstin	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Scientific Director, Vertebrate Genome Biology	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lindgren, Cecilia	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lindstroem, Sara	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Locke, Adam	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Assistant Professor of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member

MANE, SHRIKANT	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
MATISE, TARA	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor and Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
MEAD, DAVID	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Founder and Chief Executive Officer	Peer Review Consultant Member
MODIANO, JAIME	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Professor of Oncology	Peer Review Consultant Member
MULLIKIN, JAMES	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Senior Scientist	Peer Review Consultant Member
Marth, Gabor	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Maschke, Karen	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Research Scholar	Peer Review Consultant Member
Mason, Christopher	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
McCarthy, James	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Chairman's Fund Professor and Program Leader	Peer Review Consultant Member
McEUN, PAUL	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
McPherson, John	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Myers, Richard	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	President and Science Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
NEKRUTENKO, ANTON	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Nelson, Alondra	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Nelson, John	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Senior Principal Scientist	Peer Review Consultant Member
OLIVIER, MICHAEL	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
OSTRANDER, ELAINE	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Chief and Distinguished Investigator	Peer Review Consultant Member
PAN, TAO	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Peterson, Susan	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Postma, Hendrik	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Powell, Bradford	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Clinical Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Province, Michael	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
RASMUSSEN, SONJA	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Rehm, Heidi	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHATZ, MICHAEL	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Bloomberg Distinguished Associate Professor of Computer Science and Biology	Peer Review Consultant Member
SKOWYRA, DOROTA	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
STAMATOYANNOPOULOS, JOHN	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
STEIN, LINCOLN	11/09/2018	11/09/2018	Director, University of Toronto	Peer Review Consultant Member
STORMO, GARY	03/13/2019	03/13/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Sankar, Pamela	03/21/2019	03/21/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Schriml, Lynn	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Shortreed, Michael	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Senior Scientist	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sinsheimer, Janet	11/09/2018	11/09/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Stewart, Douglas	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Stadtman Investigator	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sutton, Granger	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
TALKOWSKI, MICHAEL	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
TANTISIRA, KELAN	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
TUSCHL, THOMAS	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tabard-Cossa, Vincent	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Taylor, James	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tishkoff, Sarah	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tung, Steve	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Van Ziffle, Jessica	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Vassy, Jason	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Assistant Professor of Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
WASHINGTON, MARY	12/14/2018	12/14/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
WATSON, MARK	12/14/2018	12/14/2018	Associate Professor of Pathology	Peer Review Consultant Member
WENG, CHUNHUA	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
WHITE, PETER	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
WORLEY, KIM	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wang, Ting	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Weinshilboum, Richard	03/25/2019	03/25/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Weller, Jennifer	06/11/2019	06/11/2019	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Weninger, Keith	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
White, Henry	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
White, Owen	06/27/2019	06/27/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wright, Cynthia	03/22/2019	03/22/2019	Professor and Associate Dean	Peer Review Consultant Member
Yin, Peng	12/06/2018	12/07/2018	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHU, XIAOFENG	06/19/2019	06/19/2019	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 123**Narrative Description**

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -(A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts...

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

2,310

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by

Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

The agency provides written and oral reports.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of “approved” or “recommended” for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH’s funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant’s management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval	120
What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval	120
What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval	\$466,991,843

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- Contact DFO
- Online Agency Web Site
- Online Committee Web Site
- Online GSA FACA Web Site
- Publications
- Other

Access Comments

Contact IC Committee Management Officer. 240-669-5201